

**EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT FOR
FENOXAPROP-ETHYL**

VOLUME IIa

EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT FOR ORNAMENTAL,
RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TURF USES

David Haskell, Associate Environmental Research Scientist

HS-1716
May 10, 1996

Worker Health & Safety Branch
Department of Pesticide Regulation
California Environmental Protection Agency

ESTIMATION OF EXPOSURE OF PERSONS IN CALIFORNIA TO FENOXAPROP-ETHYL FROM ORNAMENTAL AND TURF USES

BY

David Haskell, Associate Environmental Research Scientist

ABSTRACT

Fenoxaprop-ethyl is currently registered for use in California as a selective post emergent rice herbicide. Anomalies in fetal rats and liver toxicity in adult laboratory animals dosed with this chemical prompted the risk assessment for fenoxaprop-ethyl. The Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company has submitted an application to register fenoxaprop-ethyl for use on turfgrass, ornamentals and rights-of-way. The Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide label permits applications to be made with a ground boom tractor, low or high volume spraygun or hand-held sprayer. Estimates of the occupational exposure to fenoxaprop-ethyl from applying Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide range from 0.20-5.85 mg per workday. Although human dermal absorption data are not available, results from a rat study indicate that 73% of a 2.3 ug/cm² dose was considered absorbed after a 10-hour exposure period. The estimated mean absorbed daily dosage for applications made at the maximum label rate were 5.72 ug/kg/day for a golf course maintenance applicator and 56.4 ug/kg/day for a residential pest control operator making applications with a hand-held spray gun. Adults performing various recreational activities (picnicing, sun bathing, touch football, weeding) on treated turf experienced an estimated 3.94 ug/kg/day dose of fenoxaprop-ethyl. The incidental exposure incurred from mowing a treated lawn or turf is expected to be insignificant.

INTRODUCTION

The exposure assessment for the use of fenoxaprop-ethyl in rice has been completed and fenoxaprop-ethyl is currently registered for use in California as Whip[®] 1EC Herbicide for the control of grassy weeds in rice (Wang and Haskell, 1994). The manufacturer of fenoxaprop-ethyl, the Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company, has submitted an application to register fenoxaprop-ethyl for use on ornamental plantings, rights-of-way and turfgrass, including sodfarms. As the physical and chemical properties of a pesticide can impact the dermal absorption rate and *in vivo* metabolism, a summary of these properties is present in the exposure assessment (Wang and Haskell, 1994). The label permits applications to be made with a hand-held spray wand or gun which are known to cause higher rates of occupational exposure. In the report by Rutz and Krieger (1992), exposure rates (ug of exposure per lb of a.i. applied) for hand-held spray gun or wand applications were reported to be several orders of magnitude greater than applications with a boom equipped tractor. The use of Acclaim[®] by pest control operators to control grassy weeds in residential lawns has the potential to cause exposure to the occupants.

PRODUCT FORMULATIONS

Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide has been formulated as an emulsifiable concentrate with one pound of fenoxaprop-ethyl per gallon equivalent to 12.5% of the product by weight. The request is to register its use for the selective post-emergent control of grassy weeds in turf, ornamental landscaping and along rights-of-way.

USAGE

The supplemental label for the proposed registration of Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide in California allows the selective post-emergent control of annual and perennial grasses in residential and commercial turfgrass, sodfarms, ornamental plantings and in rights-of-way. The label permits applications to be made with a ground boom tractor, low or high volume spraygun or with a hand-held sprayer. Label rates range from 0.031-0.35 lb a.i. per acre depending on the site and the stage of growth of the weed species. For small turf areas and ornamental plantings, the rates are 0.0007-0.008 lb a.i. per 1,000 ft². The recommended dilution rates are 30-100 gallons of water per acre or 0.7-1.4 gallons of mixture per 1,000 ft², depending on the application method. Thorough spray coverage is essential for optimum control of the target species. A minimum interval of 14 days should be observed between successive applications.

A maximum of 1.08 lbs of a.i. can be applied per acre to turf, ornamental plantings and rights-of-way during one growing season. Application to sod is not permitted within four weeks of cutting for transplanting. Acclaim® may not be applied with any type of irrigation system. Treated areas should not be mowed for at least 24 hours to allow sufficient time for the active ingredient to penetrate and translocate in the target species.

LABEL PRECAUTIONS

The Acclaim® IEC Herbicide label carries the signal word, "WARNING" and the precautionary statements indicate the category II toxicity classification is due to temporary eye injury that is reversible within 7 days. The statements for oral, inhalation and dermal exposure indicate these routes have a toxicity category III classification. The following protective clothing must be worn by applicators and other workers handling Acclaim®: long pants and long-sleeved shirt, chemical resistant gloves, protective eyewear, shoes and socks. For sodfarm uses only, the federal Worker Protection Standard (WPS) lists a restricted-entry interval (REI) of 24 hours for unprotected workers.

WORKER ILLNESSES/INJURIES

Since the active ingredient of Acclaim®, fenoxaprop-ethyl, was recently registered for use on rice in 1994, data regarding exposure-related illnesses in California are not available.

DERMAL IRRITATION/SENSITIZATION

Fenoxaprop-ethyl has a low acute mammalian toxicity. It is classified as a category II eye irritant. The label requires eye protection and impermeable rubber gloves to be worn by applicators and other handlers. A dermal sensitization test conducted with guinea pigs did not indicate this product is an animal dermal sensitizer (Jung and Weigand, 1982).

DERMAL ABSORPTION

Dermal absorption data from a human study were not available. However, the rate of absorption of fenoxaprop-ethyl through the skin of rats has been studied and submitted (Laveglia *et al.*, 1986). Four groups of 20 animals each were exposed to a dermal dose of 2.3, 23, 231, or 2315 ug/cm² for 10 hours. The excreta was collected for up to 72 hours after the dose was washed off. Researchers observed that a high percentage of the dose was bound to

the treatment site with an average of only 24% of the dose for all dose groups removed during wash-off. The presence of fenoxaprop-ethyl equivalents in the urine and feces up to 72 hours after the exposure indicates that a large portion of the bound skin residues is bioavailable. For the low dose rats, 73% of the dermal dose was considered absorbed and bioavailable after a 10-hour exposure period (Wang and Haskell, 1994).

ANIMAL METABOLISM

The metabolism of fenoxaprop-ethyl has been studied extensively in rats and the following results were summarized from the indicated studies. With an oral dose of 2 mg/kg, the percent of the dose excreted as ¹⁴C equivalents of fenoxaprop-ethyl after 96 hours was 42.1-53.9% in the urine and 33.8-40.4% in the feces (Dorn *et al.*, 1985). The observed lack of detectable parent material in the urine indicates the metabolism is complete when absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract. Two primary metabolites, that may be suitable for use as biological markers for urinary monitoring, were observed in the urine: benzoxazol mercapturic acid and hydroxyphenoxy propionic acid (Dorn *et al.*, 1985; Burkle *et al.*, 1985). The elimination of fenoxaprop-ethyl and/or its metabolites in the urine and feces is biphasic with an initial excretion half-life of 8.5-12.5 hours followed by a slower second phase of 27-73 hours for urine and 27-34 hours for feces (Kellner and Eckert, 1984). With an oral dose of 2 or 10 mg/kg, 2.2 to 5.1% of the dose was detected in the tissues seven days after administration, indicating a long tissue half-life (Kellner and Eckert, 1982; Kellner and Eckert, 1984). The residual metabolites were detected in the adipose tissue and excretory organs such as the kidneys. With respect to the effect of sex and dosage rate on metabolism, there were no qualitative differences discerned in the excreted metabolites. However, there may be quantitative differences with respect to certain chemical species of metabolites being transformed and excreted (Dorn *et al.*, 1985).

OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE

I. Application

The Acclaim® IEC Herbicide product label permits applications to be made with a variety of equipment to residential and commercial turf grass, ornamental plantings and rights-of-way. The use of Acclaim® is projected to occur primarily on golf course turf and residential lawns. The application equipment used on ornamental plantings and rights-of-way are similar to those used on golf courses and by residential pest control operators. And because the

application rates and timing of the applications are the same, the occupational exposure estimates from the golf course and residential turf treatments will represent the exposure estimates for all uses on the Acclaim® 1EC Herbicide.

Occupational exposure data to support these uses were not submitted by the manufacturer. The Pesticide Handlers Exposure Database (PHED, 1995) was used to derive estimates of the exposure to fenoxaprop-ethyl for the various application methods. As a database composed of the results from studies which did not follow a standardized protocol, PHED has limitations to its use as a surrogate database. The PHED database was constructed as a summary of the exposure data from many studies, each with a different minimum detection level (MDL) for the analytical method used to detect residues in the sampling media. And since the detection of dermal exposure to the body regions was not standardized, some studies observed exposure to only selected body regions such as the hands, arms and face, with the other body regions considered 100% protected from exposure by work clothing. As a consequence the subsets derived from the database for dermal exposure have different number of observations (n) for each of the body regions. The calculation of a standard deviation for the mean dermal exposure rate for the whole body is therefore not appropriate because the mean rate was derived as the sum of the mean rates for each body region which were derived from various numbers of observations (replicates). Although confidence intervals were provided for the derived mean dermal and inhalation rates, they may not represent an accurate expression of their variability. The physical properties of each pesticide were not included in the selection criteria for the database. As a consequence, the surrogate data derived for a specific pesticide can not be subsetting on the basis of similar physical properties such as vapor pressure, etc. In recognition of these limitations, PHED was used to derive data subsets that estimate the occupational exposure to fenoxaprop-ethyl for work tasks related to the application of Acclaim® 1EC Herbicide.

The use of Acclaim® for the postemergent control of annual and perennial grasses in turf, ornamentals and rights-of-way is dependent on the site and weed species. Use rates at a specific site can range from 0.031-0.35 lb a.i./acre depending on the stage of growth of the weed species. The control of crabgrass on golf courses and commercial landscaping are projected to be the likely uses of this product in California (Hervardi, 1994). The use season would be approximately three months per year (late spring to early summer) depending on location with a maximum of two treatments per season. On golf courses, applications of Acclaim® would take place primarily on greens, practice greens and tees with only limited use on the fairways (Hernandez, 1995). For an 18 hole course, these areas constitute approximately 200,000 ft². Applications would take place early in the morning before the

players arrive. If the golf course maintenance supervisor treated all the greens, practice greens and tees in one morning at the label rate for untilled crabgrass (0.0027 a.i./1,000 ft ²) or at the maximum label rate for crabgrass control (0.008 lb a.i./1,000 ft ²), he would handle 0.54 or 1.6 lbs of fenoxypop-ethyl, respectively.

Acclaim[®] IEC Herbicide does have some potential for use on sod farms. The production manager for a large sod farm in the Central Valley indicated that barnyardgrass and sprangletop infestations can become a problem. Weed control in sod production is generally accomplished with preplant fumigation, use of weed-free seed for planting and pre and post emergent herbicides. The use of herbicides on growing sod entails some risk because of the potential for phytotoxicity with some active ingredients. However, the post emergent use of Acclaim[®] may be needed to control these grassy weeds.

Sod farms typically make several plantings a season to insure a supply of sod for most of the year. Each planting can range from 10-30 acres, depending on the time of year and take about 6-9 months to mature. On a large ranch, three-four hundred acres could be planted during one growing season. Sod can become infested with grassy weeds like barnyardgrass from planting contaminated seed. Herbicide applications are typically made with tractors equipped with boom sprayers that can drive over the growing sod. To prevent the loss of the planting, an emergency application of Acclaim[®] might be made when the turf is old enough to tolerate the temporary phytotoxicity that can occur with some turf species. At the maximum label rate for seedling Kentucky bluegrass (0.078 lb a.i./acre), the production manager could handle 2.3 lbs of fenoxaprop-ethyl during a 30 acre application. Since older turf could be treated at the maximum rate of 0.35 lb a.i. per acre, an applicator could handle 10.5 lbs of a.i. per 30 acre treatment. Assuming the production manager treated five plantings per season, he might treat 150 acres in a year.

The PHED database was used to derive an estimate of the exposure when an applicator mixes, loads and applies a pesticide with a tractor equipped with a boom sprayer. A subset was generated from the MLAP file in PHED with the following selection criteria:

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Dermal grade-uncovered	All grades of studies A-E to maximize the number of replicates
Dermal grade-covered	All grades of studies A-E to maximize the number of replicates
Hand grade	All grades of studies A-E to maximize the number of replicates
Formulation	Emulsifiable concentrate or aqueous suspension or solution
Study location	Outdoor
Application method	Ground boom tractor

Total lbs a.i. applied	Greater than 5.0
Exposure units	ug/pound of a.i. sprayed
Inhalation rate	25 L/min (PHED default)
Exposure	Combined dermal/inhalation
Head patches	Used actual and estimated head patches
Normal work clothing	Long pants, long-sleeved shirt, rubber gloves

The following mean (arithmetic) rates of exposure per pound of a.i. applied were computed from the subset: 0.37 mg of dermal exposure and 0.0035 mg of inhalation exposure (Appendix A). A golf course maintenance supervisor wearing the label required work clothing or coveralls, face shield or goggles, and gloves could experience the following estimated rates of exposure: (a) 0.54 lb a.i. handled-0.20 mg of dermal exposure and 0.0019 mg of inhalation exposure per workday or (b) 1.6 lbs a.i. handled-0.59 mg of dermal exposure and 0.0056 mg of inhalation exposure per workday. The production manager on a sod farm could experience: (a) 2.3 lbs a.i. handled-0.85 mg of dermal exposure and 0.0081 mg of inhalation exposure or (b) 10.5 lbs a.i. handled-3.89 mg of dermal exposure and 0.020 mg of inhalation exposure.

A pest control advisor specializing in golf courses projects residential pest control operators (PCOs) and landscape maintenance personnel will be the greatest users of Acclaim[®] (Eckert, 1994). The ChemLawn[®] Company is a nationwide company that specializes in residential and commercial lawn care. Dr. Law, the Regional Technical Manager for ChemLawn[®] in California, indicated that tank sizes on their trucks can range from 100-400 gallons (Law, 1995). This tank is used to apply liquid fertilizers, sometimes in combination with 2,4-D and MCPA as a total lawn treatment. A second 30 gallon tank is used exclusively to mix and apply pesticides. The spray system on the trucks is calibrated to apply fertilizer and pesticide mixtures at a rate of 2 gallons of mix per 1,000 ft² of lawn equivalent to a dilution rate of 87 gallons per acre. Dr. Law indicated Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide will probably be used as a "spot" treatment to control crabgrass infestations in lawns and landscaping strips. Although the growing season for crabgrass is several months, efficacious control will occur early in the season before the plants become too large and start seed production. The average residential customer has 3,000 ft² of lawn and one PCO can treat 15-45 customers per day. Most accounts are on a monthly basis for fertilizer and weed control treatments. If a third of the customers request the crabgrass treatment on an annual basis, the PCO could treat 30 days during the 92 day use season (May-July). On a daily basis, if one operator treated 33% of the accounts for crabgrass, a maximum of 15 accounts per day or one acre of lawn would be treated. The 30-gallon tank will be used to mix and load the Acclaim[®] and it can be applied separately as needed from the fertilizer. If the PCO applies three tankloads of Acclaim[®] per

workday at the 87-gallon per acre dilution rate with a hand-held spraygun, he can treat approximately one acre per day. At the label rate for untillered crabgrass (0.0027 a.i./1,000 ft²) in turf and landscaping, the residential PCO could handle 0.12 lbs of fenoxprop-ethyl per workday. At the maximum label rate (0.008 lb a.i./1,000 ft²) for crabgrass control, the residential PCO may handle 0.35 lb a.i. per workday.

A second subset was generated with PHED using the MLAP file for a worker that mixes, loads and applies a pesticide with a hand-held wand with the following criteria:

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Dermal grade-uncovered replicates	All grades of studies A-E to maximize the number of replicates
Dermal grade-covered	All grades of studies A-E to maximize the number of replicates
Hand grade	All grades of studies A-E to maximize the number of replicates
Formulation	Emulsifiable concentrate or aqueous suspension or solution
Study location	Outdoor
Application method	Low or high pressure hand wand
Total lbs a.i. applied	Greater than 5.0
Exposure units	ug/pound of a.i. sprayed
Inhalation rate	25 L/min (PHED default)
Exposure	Combined dermal/inhalation
Head patches	Used actual and estimated head patches
No clothing-total deposition	Generated more observations for each body region

When the subset was queried for workers wearing long pants, long-sleeved shirt and chemical resistant gloves, only observations of exposure to the head, neck and hands were listed for the hand-held wand application method. However, if the workers potential dermal exposure was queried (total deposition to clothing and skin), observations of exposure were included for all body regions. The following mean (arithmetic) exposure rates were computed from the subset for workers not wearing clothing: 167 mg of dermal exposure and 0.049 mg of inhalation exposure per lb of a.i. applied (Appendix B). The residential pest control operator handling 0.12 lb of fenoxaprop-ethyl per workday could experience an estimated 20 mg of potential dermal exposure and 0.0059 mg of inhalation exposure. At the maximum label rate he could experience 58.5 mg via the dermal route and 0.017 mg via inhalation. The dermal values can be reduced by 90% to account for the protection provided by wearing long pants and a long-sleeved shirt or coveralls, face shield or goggles, and chemical resistant gloves (Thongsinthusak *et al.*, 1993a). At the typical and maximum label rates, the rate of dermal exposure per workday for the residential PCO was 2.0 mg and 5.85 mg, respectively.

The following table summarizes the estimated occupational exposure expected from utilizing the application methods available on the Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide label to make treatments to various sites. For the exposure assessment, the absorbed daily dose (ADD) and the seasonal absorbed daily dose (SADD) need to be calculated to determine if the margin of safety (MOS) is adequate for a acute or subchronic adverse health effect.

TABLE I. PHED Estimate of Occupational Exposure for Workers Mixing, Loading and Applying Fenoxaprop-Ethyl to Turf and Landscaping

Tasks (Mixing/Loading Application)	PHED Exposure Per Lb A.I. Handled (mg)		Dermal Exposure ^{a,b} (mg/person/day)	Inhalation Exposure ^b (mg/person/day)	Absorbed Daily Dosage ^c (ug/kg/day)	Seasonal Average Daily Dosage ^{c,d} (ug/kg/day)
Ground Boom on Golf Course Turf*						
untillered label rate	0.37	0.0035	0.20	0.0019	1.94	0.042
maximum label rate	0.37	0.0035	0.59	0.0056	5.72	0.12
PHED database N=91						
Ground Boom on Sod Farm**						
low rate for						
Kentucky bluegrass	0.37	0.0035	0.85	0.0081	8.23	0.45
maximum label rate	0.37	0.0035	3.89	0.037	37.7	2.05
PHED database N=91						
Hand-Held Boom on Landscaping***						
untillered label rate	16.7	0.049	2.0	0.0059	19.3	6.29
maximum label rate	16.7	0.049	5.85	0.017	56.4	18.4
PHED database N=44						

Haskell, WH&S Branch, 1996

* Worker handled 0.54 or 1.6 lbs a.i.

** Worker handled 2.3 or 10.5 lbs a.i.

*** Worker handled 0.12 or 0.35 lb a.i.

^a The PHED dermal exposure rate for the hand-held wand application was derived from the database with the worker wearing no clothing. Since the Acclaim[®] label does require the worker to wear long pants and long-sleeved shirt, chemical resistant gloves, protective eyewear, shoes and socks, the dermal exposure rate was reduced by 90% (Thongsinthusak *et al.*, 1993a).

^b Values expressed as the arithmetic mean and represent the product of the appropriate PHED exposure rate and the lbs a.i. handled as indicated by the asterisks.

^c The exposure assessment utilized a 73% dermal absorption rate for fenoxaprop-ethyl (Wang and Haskell, 1994) and a 50% inhalation uptake (Raabe, 1988) to calculate the ADD and SADD for a 75.9 kg man (Thongsinthusak *et al.*, 1993a).

^d The SADD was calculated with a 92-day annual use season (May-July) and two application days per season for the golf course operator (Hervardi, 1994), five days for the sod farm manager and 30 days per year for the residential PCO. Although the growing season for crabgrass in California is several months, control of this grass with fenoxypop-ethyl becomes increasingly difficult as the plants become larger. Applications should also be made early enough in the growing season to prevent seed production.

II. Occupational Exposure from Treated Sites

Routine tasks may require workers to enter treated areas or handle treated turf which have the potential to cause exposure to residues of fenoxaprop-ethyl. The federal Worker Protection Standards do not apply to workers entering areas where pesticide use has occurred on turf, ornamental plantings and right-of-way sites with the exception of sod farms. For treatments on sod farms, a minimum restricted entry interval of 24 hours is mandated for unprotected workers. The Acclaim[®] 1 EC Herbicide label does recommend that treated turf should not be cut for sod within four weeks of treatment.

Turf grown for sod is harvested by a machine that cuts the sod into strips approximately 18 inches wide and 6 feet in length. The cut sod is then rolled up with the soil side out and loaded onto pallets. Workers rolling and stacking the sod may come in contact with treated foliage. Workers laying sod that has been treated with Acclaim[®] may also come in contact with foliar residues.

A photodegradation study of ¹⁴C-labeled fenoxaprop-ethyl on a loamy sand soil surface observed this compound is photochemically labile (Gildemeister and Jordan, 1984). At zero hours after the application, 97.7% of the radioactivity was recovered and associated with the parent compound. Forty-six percent of the initial radioactivity associated with the parent material was detected after 4 hours of irradiation time and 3.8 % of the radioactivity after 45 hours of irradiation. The parent compound was observed to readily degrade into the acid form which accounted for 50% of the radioactivity after 4 hours of irradiation. This metabolite was observed to be less photochemically labile than the parent and accounted for 24% of the radioactivity after 45 hours of irradiation. The 28-day preharvest interval will permit the residues of the parent material and its primary metabolite to degrade through many half-lives. If the degradation is estimated at three half-lives per day, assuming 12 hours of light per day, then the residue levels after the application will degrade through approximately 80 half-lives in 28 days. An estimated 4×10^{-27} % of the initial deposition of the parent material will be present after 28 days which is below any analytical detection limit. The exposure to fenoxaprop-ethyl incurred from workers harvesting or laying treated sod is expected to be insignificant.

Maintenance workers on golf courses and landscapers could experience exposure to fenoxaprop-ethyl from mowing treated turf. The Acclaim[®] 1 EC Herbicide label recommends a minimum interval of 24 hours between treatment and mowing. The maximum label rate for the control of crabgrass in turf is 0.008 lb a.i. per 1,000 ft² or 0.35 lb a.i. per

acre. This maximum application rate is equivalent to 3.6 g of a.i. per 1,000 ft². The amount of foliar residues that could be considered dislodgeable and potentially available for exposure was estimated from a study that observed the residues of 2,4-D present after a lawn application. In the study by Harris and Solomon (1992), a liquid mixture of 2,4-D amine/mecoprop/dicamba was applied by a professional lawn care company at a rate equivalent to 10 g of 2,4-D per 1,000 ft² of lawn. As 2,4-D has a low vapor pressure and the application rate and technique were similar to those permitted by the Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide, the study was considered a suitable surrogate for fenoxypop-ethyl. One hour after the application, the dislodgeable residues were measured by rubbing moistened cheesecloth attached to a pair of shoes on the treated lawn. A mean value of 8.45 ±0.927 mg/m² of a.i. was detected from the five plots that were sampled which represented 7.6% of the initial application. If the same percentage of fenoxypop-ethyl foliar residues are present and dislodgeable after the 3.6 g/1,000 ft² application, then 0.27 g/1,000 ft² (0.29 µg/cm²) could be considered available for exposure. The incidental exposure incurred from mowing treated turf or lawn is expected to be insignificant, due in part to a low level of DFR present and the low probability of the DFR becoming airborne during mowing and available for inhalation.

III. Non-Occupational Exposure from Treated Sites

The Acclaim[®] 1 EC Herbicide label does not provide a "reentry interval" for persons entering treated areas for recreational purposes. Adults or children playing on a lawn that has been treated a few hours earlier with fenoxaprop-ethyl could be subject to some incidental exposure to foliar residues. A study by Vaccaro *et al.* (1993) observed the exposure to chlorpyrifos via biomonitoring for adults performing various recreational activities on lawns treated with

Dursban[®]. From the biomonitoring data, an estimate of the dermal and inhalation exposure to chlorpyrifos was extrapolated for adults. A mean absorbed dermal dose of 458 µg was derived for the eight adults participating in the study. With an estimated dermal absorption rate of 9.6% for chlorpyrifos, the calculated dermal exposure from the biomonitoring data was 4.77 mg (Thongsinthusak *et al.*, 1993b). Since chlorpyrifos has a low vapor pressure and the application rate and technique were similar to those permitted by the Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide, the study was considered a suitable surrogate for fenoxypop-ethyl. To utilize the data, the exposure rates have to be reduced to reflect the difference in application rates between the chlorpyrifos and fenoxaprop-ethyl labels. The rate of Dursban[®] applied in the Vaccaro study (0.094 lb a.i./1,000 ft²) was 11.75 times greater than the maximum rate (0.008

lb a.i./1,000 ft²) allowed for crabgrass control on the Acclaim[®] 1EC Herbicide label. The 0.41 mg dermal dose of fenoxaprop-ethyl per day for adults was derived by reducing the dermal dose from the chlorpyrifos study by a factor of 11.75. This translates into an ADD (dermal absorption 73%) of 3.94 ug/kg/day for a 75.9 kg adult.

EXPOSURE APPRAISAL

There are factors used to estimate occupational exposure and to calculate the Absorbed Daily Dosage that are conservative (tendency to overestimate the value of concern) in nature. These factors are real, but are typically buried in the methods of estimating exposure and are not acknowledged. This section is an attempt to put these experimental factors in perspective with what will actually happen in the work place.

A. Occupational exposure assessment

The PHED data base was used to derive the occupational exposure estimates when fenoxaprop-ethyl is applied with a handgun or ground boom tractor. The data base is comprised of data from exposure studies that utilize patch dosimetry almost exclusively. This dosimetry method was introduced by Durham and Wolfe (1962) as a means of estimating dermal exposure for pesticide workers. For those studies that utilized patch dosimetry to measure dermal exposure, approximately half of the data points in PHED are reported as non-detectable. Because a majority of the studies in the database are more than 10 years old, many of the detection limits are $>0.1 \text{ ug/cm}^2$. For data reported as non detected, we use, by default, 1/2 of the limit of detection (LOD). Thus, the net effect is that an unmeasured residue below the detection limit becomes a major component of the exposure. For example, assuming a body surface of $20,000 \text{ cm}^2$ and a 0.1 ug/cm^2 detection limit, the estimated exposure if all patches were non detects would be 2000 ug.

B. Dermal Absorption Rate

Skin is the primary route of worker exposure (Wolfe, 1976), accounting on average for 99% of the potential pesticide exposure for pesticide handlers. The 73% dermal absorption rate used to calculate the ADD was derived from a rat study in which most of the dermal dose of fenoxyp-ethyl remained bound to the skin after wash off. Only 24% of the dose was recovered from the wash water. This high level of bound material could be due to the lipophilicity of fenoxyp-ethyl or to covalent or hydrogen bonding with the skin. Less than 10% of the dose was detected in the tissues and carcass. However, for the rats held 72 hours after washing the dose, 12% of the dose was detected as fenoxaprop-ethyl equivalents in the excreta. Without additional excretion data that could identify the fate of the bound skin

residues over time and the observation that fenoxaprop-ethyl equivalents continue to be excreted after 24 hours, the assumption has to be made that the bound skin residues will ultimately be bioavailable (Zendzian, 1994). Although the excretion data does indicate some of the bound skin residues were ultimately bioavailable, the total percentage of the dose detected in the carcass and tissues or excreta was only 22%. In light of the study data, the 73% absorption rate is a conservative value for use in estimating the ADD.

Another factor that may contribute to an overestimation of dose is the difference between absorption rates derived from animal studies and the rates observed in human studies. The rat is the most commonly used model to estimate dermal absorption. This is because rats are relatively cheap and most of the toxicological testing is done on rats. Also, many companies have an aversion to using humans for the determination of dermal absorption, even though they are the species for which risk assessment is intended. However, the rat typically overestimates human dermal absorption by two to ten fold. This has been demonstrated in approximately a dozen different compounds tested in both rats and man (Wester and Maibach, 1977; Shah and Guthrie, 1983; Wester and Maibach, 1993; Feldmann and Maibach, 1974; Sanborn, 1994; Thongsinthusak, 1994). Rabbits typically have even higher absorption than rats (Wester and Maibach, 1977).

The mean rat dermal absorption for 26 pesticides from several different chemical classes was $19\% \pm 16\%$ (Thongsinthusak *et al.*, 1993c). Thus at the 95th percentile, dermal absorption for pesticides in general would be 51%. The 73% dermal absorption rate which was derived with the assumption that all bound skin residues are ultimately bioavailable, is very conservative in comparison to pesticides in general.

C. Estimating the Absorbed Daily Dose

Dosage is expressed as a single static value both in worker exposure and animal toxicology studies. The rate of dermal absorption is always lower than the rate of oral absorption in animals used for toxicology testing. Adverse effects occur only when plasma levels in the target organ exceed a critical level. However, dermal acquisition occurs over the entire work day, and because dermal absorption is slower than oral, plasma levels for the same total absorbed dosage will not be nearly as high for a dermal dose acquired over an entire day versus an oral bolus dose. A dermal dose acquired over the entire workday produces peak plasma levels much lower than the bolus oral feeding dosage acquired by animals in seconds to minutes. Because effect is highly dependent on plasma level, treating an eight hour dermal acquisition as though it were a bolus (i.e., summing the entire dermal dose) is extremely conservative. The net effect of assuming instantaneous dermal dose acquisition and

absorption is an overestimate of peak plasma concentration compared to the oral route by several fold for the same absorbed dose (Auton *et al.*, 1993). Lower urinary metabolite concentrations (an indication of lower peak plasma concentrations) are also seen with dermally applied pesticides when compared with the urinary metabolite concentration observed following oral dosing (Krieger *et al.*, 1991).

D. Conclusion About Exposure Estimates

These factors are operating in the exposure assessment for fenoxaprop-ethyl and because they are multiplicative, result in overestimates of the ADD of eight or more fold. The concern that the maximally exposed individual is not adequately represented by mean estimates of exposure is not well founded when considering all the "hidden" conservatism built into all estimates of exposure resulting from the dermal route.

REFERENCES

- Auton, J. R., Ramsey, J. D., and Woollen, B. H. 1993. Modeling dermal pharmacokinetics using *in vitro* data. Part II. Fluazifop-butyl in man. *Human and Experimental Toxicol* 12:207-213.
- Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., The Regulatory Practice. Applicator exposure studies with chlorothalonil (Bravo® 500) fungicide. Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 275-072.
- Burkle, W. L., Schmidt, E., and Rutz, U. 1985. Fenoxaprop-ethyl (dioxiphenyl-1- ¹⁴C), metabolism in rats orally administered at two doses, 2 and 10 mg/kg body weight. Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-031.
- Dorn, E., Schmidt, E., Rutz, U., Kellner, H. M., and Leist, K. H. 1985. Metabolism in male and female rats after single and repeated oral administration, respectively, of a low and a high dose, respectively. Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-031.
- Durham, W. F. and Wolfe, H. R. 1962. Measurement of the exposure of workers to pesticides. *Bull. WHO* 26: 75-91.

- Eckert, 1994. Pest Control Advisor. Personal conversation on September 9.
- Feldmann, R. J. and Maibach, H. I. 1974. Percutaneous penetration of some pesticides and herbicides in man. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol* 28:126-132.
- Gildemeister, H. and Jordan, H. J. 1984. ¹⁴C-labeled Hoe 033171-photodegradation study on soil. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-057, section 161-3.
- Harris, S. and Solomon, K. 1992. Human exposure to 2,4-D following controlled activities on recently sprayed turf. *J. Environ. Sci. Health*, B27(1), 9-22.
- Hernandez, E. 1995. Superintendent of Alta Vista Golf Course, Placentia, CA. Personal conversation on January 24th.
- Hervardi, A. 1994. U.C. Cooperative Extension Specialist on Turf. Personal conversation on August 15th.
- Jung and Weigand, 1982. Test for sensitizing properties of Hoe 33171 OH AS201 in the guinea pig according to BUEHLER.. Pharma Research Toxicology, Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-002.
- Kellner, H. M. and Eckert, H. G. 1982. Fenoxaprop-ethyl (chlorophenyl-U- ¹⁴C), study of kinetics and residue determinations following oral and intravenous application in rats. Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-031.
- Kellner, H. M. and Eckert, H. G. 1984. Fenoxaprop-ethyl (chlorophenyl-U- ¹⁴C), study of kinetics and residue concentration following repeated oral applications of 2 mg/kg day in rats. Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-031.
- Krieger, R. I., Thongsinthusak, T., Ross, J. H., Brodberg, R., Taylor, S., Fredrickson, S., Begum, S., and Dong, M. H. 1991. Situational chemical exposure studies provide human metabolism and urine clearance for chlorpyrifos, dimethoate, and malathion. DPR, Worker Health and Safety (WH&S) Branch, HS-1618.

- Laveglia, J., Resnis, P., and Craine, E. M. 1986. A dermal study in rats with formulated ¹⁴C-HOE 33171. WIL Research Laboratories. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 51910-032.
- Law, Dr. 1995. Toxicologist for ChemLawn[®] Company. Personal conversation on 6/16/95.
- Pesticide Handlers Exposure Data Base (PHED), 1995. Versar, Inc. Washington, DC. Version 1.1.
- Raabe, O. G. 1988. Inhalation uptake of xenobiotic vapours by people . California Air Resources Board, Contract A 5-155-33. University of California, Davis, California.
- Rutz, R. and Krieger, R. 1992. Exposure to pesticide mixer/loaders and applicators in California. *Review of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, Vol. 129. pp 121-139.
- Sanborn, J. R. 1994. Human exposure assessment for propoxur. DPR, WH&S Branch, HS-1655.
- Shah, P. V. and Guthrie F. E. 1983. Percutaneous penetration of three insecticides in rats: A comparison of two methods for *in vivo* determination. *J Invest Dermatol* 80:292-293.
- Thongsinthusak, T, Meinders, D., and Ross, J. 1993a. Guidance for the preparation of human pesticide exposure assessment documents . DPR, WH&S Branch HS-1612.
- Thongsinthusak, T., Brodberg, R., Dong, M., Formoli, T., Haskell, D., Ross, J., and Sanborn, J. 1993b. Estimation of exposure of persons in California to pesticide products that contain chlorpyrifos. DPR, WH&S Branch HS-1661.
- Thongsinthusak, T., Ross, J. H., Sanborn, J. R., and Wang, R. 1993c. Dermal absorption of pesticides in animals and humans. DPR, WH&S Branch, HS-1676 .
- Thongsinthusak, T. 1994. Guthion: Dermal absorption study. *Review Memorandum*. DPR, WH&S Branch.

- Vaccaro, J. R., Nolan, R. J., Hugo, J. M., and McNett, D. A. 1993. Chlorpyrifos: Exposure to adults and children upon reentry to domestic lawns, following treatment with a chlopyrifos-based mixture. DPR, Pesticide Registration Library Doc. No. 342-456.
- Wang, R. and Haskell, D 1994. Exposure assessment for fenoxaprop-ethyl . DPR, WH&S Branch HS-1695.
- Wester, R. C. and Maibach, H. I. 1977. Percutaneous absorption in man and animal. In *Cutaneous Toxicity*, Drill, V. and Lazar, P. (eds.). pp 111-126, New York: Academic Press.
- Wester, R. C. and Maibach, H. I. 1993. Animal models for percutaneous absorption. In *Health Risk Assessment: Dermal and Inhalation Exposure and Absorption of Toxicants*, Wang, R. G. M., Knaak, J. B., Maibach, H. I. (eds.). pp 89-103, Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Wolfe, H. R. 1976. Field exposure to airborne pesticides. In *Air Pollution from Pesticides and Agricultural Processes*, R. E. Lee ed. pp 137-161, Ohio: CRC Press, Inc.
- Zendzian, R. P. 1994. Dermal absorption of pesticides. Pesticide Assessment Guidelines: Subdivision F. U. S. EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs, Health Effects Division.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR CALCULATED DERMAL EXPOSURES

Exposure Scenario: long pants, long-sleeved shirt, gloves

PATCH	DISTRIBUTION	MICROGRAMS PER LB AI SPRAYED				
LOCATION	TYPE	Median	Mean	Coef of Var	Geo. Mean	Obs
Head (all)	Other	22.88	187.2329	531.1695	18.1824	91
Neck-front	Lognormal	2.61	26.0784	462.7439	2.5186	91
Neck-back	Lognormal	1.199	15.9613	541.3663	1.1274	86
Upper arms	Lognormal	1.164	6.2942	248.9768	1.4616	27
Chest	Lognormal	3.55	7.9105	129.7427	3.312	53
Back	Lognormal	1.42	3.8849	126.3199	1.8184	53
Forearms	Lognormal	2.178	18.0492	261.5905	1.7621	24
Thighs	Other	0.764	19.901	361.9954	2.0552	31
Lower legs	Other	0.476	16.2554	386.1751	0.9961	30
Feet	Other	0.131	0.131	0.00	0.131	8
Hands	Lognormal	24.6312	72.512	195.5505	9.7794	42
TOTAL DERMAL	46.0305	61.0032	374.2108		43.1442	
INHALATION	Other	1.1089	3.5353	162.0259	0.8374	76
COMBINED	47.1394	62.1121	377.7461		43.9816	

95% Confidence Interval on Mean: DERMAL: (-6414.8033, 7163.2249)

95% Confidence Interval on Mean: INHALATION : (0.0135, 51.7886)

Inhalation rate: 25 Liters/minute

Number of Records: 91

Data file: MIXER\LOADER\APPLICATOR

Subset Name:

TEMP.NAME.MLAP

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR CALCULATED DERMAL EXPOSURES

Exposure Scenario: No Clothing (total deposition)

PATCH	DISTRIBUTION	MICROGRAMS PER LB AI SPRAYED				
LOCATION	TYPE	Median	Mean	Coef of Var	Geo. Mean	Obs
Head (all)	Lognormal	470.665	947.5139	113.9537	530.0539	44
Neck-front	Lognormal	25.6725	109.5777	151.2877	27.4268	44
Neck-back	Other	33.924	68.6788	134.7671	27.6195	44
Upper arms	Other	1407.4215	2270.6267	117.3649	1265.6316	44
Chest	Lognormal	607.5825	2593.3395	151.2877	649.1001	44
Back	Other	1094.82	2216.4506	134.7671	891.3559	44
Forearms	Lognormal	418.902	811.2881	104.3574	421.356	43
Thighs	Lognormal	1982.389	3979.6065	135.3001	1719.1109	44
Lower legs	Other	2128.315	2999.0326	124.3333	1372.4011	44
Feet	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Hands	Lognormal	116538.4615	151272.6081	87.4742	108766.0523	44
TOTAL DERM:		116777.5805	124708.153	167268.7225	115670.1081	
INHALATION:		Normal	32.3077	49.0192	100.0518	24.6859
COMBINED:		116826.5997	124740.4607	167317.7417	115694.794	44

95% Confidence Interval on Mean: DERMAL: (-1071852.452, 1406389.8977)

95% Confidence Interval on Mean: INHALATION : (-47.1082, 145.1466)

Inhalation rate: 25 Liters/minute

Number of Records: 44

Data file: MIXER\LOADER\APPLICATOR

Subset Name: NALED4.MLAP